

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE 10/764,332 01/23/2004 Lawrence P. LaFalce KBROP0100USA 5770 **EXAMINER** 7590 09/27/2004 Cynthia S. Murphy GRAHAM, MARK S Renner, Otto, Boisselle & Sklar, LLP ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

Nineteenth Floor 1621 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, OH 44115-2191

3711 DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| -  | A   | Accellance(In)               |
|--|---|------------------------------|
|  | Application No.                               | Applicant(s)                 |
| Office Action Summary  | 10/764,332                                    | LAFALCE, LAWRENCE P.         |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner                                      | Art Unit                     |
|  | Mark S. Graham                                | 3711                         |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply   |   |                              |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |   |                              |
| Status   |   |                              |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |   |                              |
|  | action is non-final.                          |                              |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar  |   | secution as to the merits is |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |   |                              |
| :  | A parto quayro, 1000 o.o. 11, 10              | 0.0.210.                     |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |                              |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.  |   |                              |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |   |                              |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |   |                              |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.  |   |                              |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |   |                              |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  |   |                              |
| Application Papers   |   |                              |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner  | r.  |                              |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.   |   |                              |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |   |                              |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |   |                              |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |   |                              |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |                              |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  | priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(a).            | -(d) or (f)                  |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:   |   |                              |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  |   |                              |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No   |   |                              |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage  |   |                              |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  |   |                              |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |   |                              |
|  |   |                              |
|  |   |                              |
| Attachment(s)  |   |                              |
| <ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> </ol>   | 4) Interview Summary (<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Da |                              |
| 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   |   | atent Application (PTO-152)  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/4/1  | 6) Other:                                     |                              |

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 7-18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dumas.

As disclosed by Dumas in Fig. 7 a golf course may be set up in the manner claimed in claims 1-18 and 21. The areas of the course not being played or the areas between fairways may be considered the central non-course region.

Concerning claims 7-9 as can be seen in Fig. 1 of Dumas tee areas may be aligned in all radial directions relative to the greens.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumas in view of Kokai. Dumas locates a clubhouse at an edge of the course. However, such may also be centrally located as disclosed by Kokai. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to so locate Dumas' clubhouse if it was desired to provide a more central location on the golf course.

Morris, Chaslot, Purdy, Terry, Futterer, Hill, and Renn have been cited for interest because they disclose similar courses.

Application/Control Number: 10/764,332 Page 3

Art Unit: 3711

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark S. Graham at telephone number 703-308-1355.

MSG 9/17/04

NExaminer OF STREET